



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sion *A* reads: "blisful Empyre" instead of "blisse of" of *B*. I have preferred to insert "Empyre" from the *A* text and to change the *n* of *pen* in the next line to *r* without further emendation, even though the reading is not entirely satisfactory.

FRANK A. PATTERSON.

Columbia University.

THE DATE OF THE SCENE OF TIECK'S *STERNBALD*.

Minor, in his edition of Tieck's *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen* (Kürschner, D. N. L., vol. 145) attempts to set the date when the scene of the novel is supposed to have taken place. The entire internal evidence of the work taken as a whole, does not bear out Minor's contention.

In the story (page 264) Franz asks the unknown monk, "Was macht der edle Rafael von Urbino? Habt Ihr ihn noch gesehen?" The monk answers, "Nein, leider hat diese Zier der edlen Malerkunst die Erde verlassen; er ist im vorigen Jahre gestorben." Minor's note to this reads, "Raphel ist 1520 gestorben. Tieck hält also auch hier den Zeitpunkt der Handlung fest, auf welchen das Gespräch zwischen Dürer und Lukas verweist: 1521."

The visit of Dürer to Lukas von Leyden, which is historical, took place in 1521, according to a note in Dürer's diary. Tieck's version of this visit is given in the course of the story, but as can be seen from a careful perusal of the novel, it is made to occur in the year before Franz' conversation with the monk. That is, Franz leaves Leyden, passes the winter in part with Vansen in Antwerp and with the beginning of the second volume, enters upon a new spring. According to this, Franz would be questioning the monk in the year 1522 which does not agree with the statement in regard to Rafael's death. It is plain that Tieck has blurred the outlines of his chronology, a discrepancy which Minor has evidently not noticed.

Now in the course of the conversation during the visit (*op. cit.* 192), Lukas is made to say that he is not yet 30 years old, indeed scarcely 29. This offers a new difficulty, for Lukas was born in 1494 and his twenty-ninth year would fall in

1523. By this reckoning Franz would be questioning the monk in 1524.

This, however, is not all, for a curious error on Tieck's part adds a final complication. Franz (page 267) asks Rafael's age at death and is told that he lived to be 39. This is quite wrong, as Tieck surely knew very well. In the Tieck-Wackenroder *Herzensergiessungen* (Jessen's ed., page 129) the age is correctly given as 37. The question now arises, was Tieck dating from a wrong birth date, from a wrong death date or was the whole an unconscious slip? If the latter, then the error persists into the *Schriften*, where in volume XVI it is still uncorrected.

While it is hardly conceivable that Tieck would deliberately add two years to Rafael's age in order to reconcile the hazy chronology of the story, yet there is a bare possibility that he has done something of this sort. Tieck may have had indefinitely in his mind the date of Lukas' age, that is, the last date of which he had been thinking during the interview. Then, with a certain Romantic disregard of events, he had felt that Franz' query was in 1523 and so juggled with Rafael's age. But if this disregard of facts can be used here, it can also be used in Minor's argument. Minor, however, inadvertently took two different years as his starting point, 1520 and 1521 and this chronology cannot be made to jibe with the other dates in the story.

From the foregoing it will be seen that any attempt to fix the date of Sternbald's "musical wanderings" is beset with insuperable difficulties and Minor has erred in supposing that 1521 is a final and fixed date. The discrepancies point certainly not to 1521 but perhaps to 1523, or what is far more likely, to a shifting series of dates from 1520 to 1524, grouped by Tieck around a few historical events. Tieck himself was well aware of these difficulties, for he says in his preface (*op. cit.*), "Man rechne mir kleine chronologische Fehler nicht zu streng nach, man handle dies kleine Buch nicht wie die Geschichte eines Staats."¹

G. H. DANTON.

Stanford University.

¹ Minor decides in favor of Tieck's authorship of "Ein Brief Joseph Berglingers in Phantasien über die Kunst [D. N. L., vol. 145, p. 75 ff.], on internal evidence as shown in the mood of the letter and in spite of the contents